



AF

IFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Charles W. PROPST, Jr.

Group Art Unit: 1772

Serial No.: 09/914,185

Examiner: C. Bruenjes

Filed: August 23, 2001

Confirmation No.: 9479

For: CONDUCTIVE OR STATIC DISSIPATIVE COATING

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER FINAL REJECTION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action mailed May 12, 2006, is respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

Initially, applicant appreciates the withdrawal of claim objections under 35 U.S.C. §112, as set forth in paragraph (1) of the preceding Office Action.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wang et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,048,679) is respectfully requested.

Although the Examiner alleges that this claim is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to MPEP §706.02(IV) which states, in relevant part, "in other words, for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly" (emphasis added). Instant claim 5 specifically recites "an aqueous methyl methacrylate polymer based solution containing a quaternary ammonium compound in an amount of 1-10 wt % based on the weight of the polymeric composition . . . ." The Examiner has noted the presence of the limitation "1-10 wt%" for the amount of quaternary ammonium compound, but alleges that such limitation "is not seen as limiting . . . ."

By the Examiner's ignoring of the express limitations of the claims and, furthermore, by the complete absence of this disclosure in the cited reference, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences will never sustain a rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

OK to enter CPB 8/22/06